

MARCH 8, 1949
550th BROADCAST

Illinois U Library Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.

J. S. Pat. Off.



Will a Union of the Democracies Now Promote Peace?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, Jr.

Speakers

OWEN J. ROBERTS

EDGAR ANSEL MOWRER

CLARENCE STREIT

JOSEPH E. JOHNSON

(See also page 12)

COMING

March 22, 1949

How Can We Legislate for General Welfare Without Curbing Personal Liberty?

March 29, 1949

What Does Democracy Really Mean?

Eighth Annual Junior Town Meeting
Sponsored by Our Times and Town Hall

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N. Y.

VOLUME 14, NUMBER 45



\$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF MARCH 8:

"Will a Union of the Democracies Now Promote Peace?"

<i>Mr. DENNY</i>	3
<i>Mr. STREIT</i>	4
<i>Mr. JOHNSON</i>	5
<i>Justice ROBERTS</i>	7
<i>Mr. MOWRER</i>	9
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	16



THE BROADCAST OF MARCH 15:

"Should the Taft-Hartley Law Be Repealed and the Administration Labor Bill Be Adopted?"



THE BROADCAST OF MARCH 22:

"How Can We Legislate for General Welfare Without Curbing Personal Liberty?"



The Broadcast-Telecast of March 8, 1949, originated in Town Hall, New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EST, over the American Broadcasting Co. Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. **Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43d St., New York 18, N. Y.** Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Town Meeting

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



MARCH 8, 1949

VOL. 14, No. 45

Will a Union of the Democracies Now Promote Peace?

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. First, I want to thank you for your excellent and thoughtful response to last week's program on the subject, "Should Communists Be Allowed To Teach in Our Colleges?" Up to date, there have been some 3,500 letters received from all over the country. Your response appears to indicate four to one against allowing Communists to teach in our colleges.

Now, to tonight's subject. Ten years ago, almost to the day, we presented a similar program to the one we are about to discuss tonight. Clarence Streit's book, *Union Now*, had just been published, and was attracting considerable attention in this country and abroad. The subject of that debate was, "Would a Union of the Democracies Save World Peace?"

In the meantime, during the ten intervening years, Mr. Streit's book has been published in four

countries in three languages, and a national organization — Federal Union, Inc. — with headquarters in Washington, has been organized.

Again, our world is threatened by war, and your Town Meeting, ever alert to explore all possible roads to peace, brings you a discussion of Clarence Streit's plan brought up to date, with a new edition of his book, *Union Now*, with five new chapters.

Mr. Streit has been joined by former Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Owen J. Roberts, and a committee of American leaders, in support of his plan. But, as is our custom in Town Meeting, Mr. Streit and Justice Roberts will be challenged by two other speakers: Mr. Joseph E. Johnson, former adviser to the United Nations Security Council, and proponent of the United Nations road to peace, and Edgar Ansel Mowrer, foreign correspondent and author of the book called *The Nightmare of American*

Foreign Policy, who is an active member and supporter of the United World Federalists.

But, let's hear first from the founder of the plan, Clarence Streit, president of Federal Union, Incorporated. Mr. Streit. (Applause.)

Mr. Streit:

Ten years ago tomorrow, I stood here in Town Hall and urged union of the civil liberty democracies. "Union now," I said, "before the catastrophe—in time to prevent it." I did not have to wear these glasses then, and some of you were not so gray at that time.

The boys who were nearing draft age ten years ago are nearing 30 now—have boys themselves—or have, perhaps, crosses to mark their graves.

Those of you who were listening then may remember the facts I gave you—facts showing that the Atlantic democracies had the power to ensure world peace peacefully, if only they would organize their power effectively by the Federal Union system that gave the United States its great strength; federate themselves in a union of free people, capable of growing to universality, as our 13 states grew to 48.

That was my first radio debate. I remember it vividly. You here in the hall applauded very generously. Mr. Denny told me he got more letters from radio listeners to that program than to any other that year. But world war, my

friends, cannot be prevented merely by clapping hands. Nor can freedom be preserved merely by writing letters, helpful though they are, and only a minority made that much effort.

The majority thought union of the free too difficult and dangerous, just as Mr. Johnson and Mr. Mowrer do now. The American people took the easier, safer course of disunion—and war. The net result? For all the war's tremendous cost in gold, goods, and grief, this vast Town Meeting of the Ains every one of the millions of persons listening now, is left facing tonight a situation resembling too much the one that 1939 faced.

Where we had a League of Nations then, we have United Nations now—a worthy institution, and would uphold it as the best that can be made on a universal scale at present, but it is not trustworthy as regards peace, Mr. Johnson.

Still disunited, the democracies still confront a formidable dictatorship that would drive from the earth such freedoms as this Town Meeting embodies. The democracies who talked of keeping Hitler from aggression by an Anglo-French alliance are rising from the rubble to talk now of stopping Stalin by a mere Atlantic Alliance.

Still without a common government, the free Atlantic community still invites another war—atom war this time. The free have won another chance, a better chance

han they had ten years ago to prevent war by union now.

The presence here of Justice Roberts is one of many signs that we are much nearer union today than we were then, but we are not so near that we can achieve it merely by resolving to do things—such as writing a letter or reading a book—that we never find time to do.

I stand, today, where I stood then, in 1939. Now, as then, freedom holds the key to peace.

Now, as then, dictatorship fearfully facilitates surprise attack in peacetime.

Now, as then, the free are in a perilous minority, totaling hardly one-seventh of our species feebly divided into a dozen sovereign nations—the United States, the six British Commonwealth democracies, France, the Lowlands, Scandinavia.

Now, as then, they need only unite their strength in one effective way by federal union to put behind world peace a double guaranty, the strongest possible. For their union would have such immense power that the Kremlin would not dare attack, and their power would be governed by such freedom that it would not be used to attack others.

Thus, by union of the Atlantic democracies, we can stabilize the world long enough to secure in peace the slow evolution needed to turn the United Nations that Mr. Johnson defends into the

world government that Mr. Mowrer urges.

Millions are ready now for a union of the free. Won't you join us, too, and give us the majority we need for action? (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Clarence Streit. Mr. Joseph E. Johnson is still a professor of history at Williams College, but has spent a great deal of time in recent years in various consultative positions in connection with the United Nations. Mr. Johnson became an officer in the State Department in 1942, was active in the Dumbarton Oaks Conference in 1944, and the Inter-American Conference in Mexico City in 1945. He was also a Deputy Representative at the last U. N. Assembly. However, tonight, Mr. Johnson speaks strictly for himself. Mr. Joseph E. Johnson, what are your views on tonight's question? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Johnson:

We had our annual Town Meeting up in Williamstown last week. Our careful Yankee citizens, before voting on issues, demanded the answers to three questions: Is it necessary? Will it do the job? What will it cost?

We members of this Town Meeting of the Air can do lots worse than to keep those same questions in mind this evening.

I wish that the issue of tonight's debate might have been, "How can we best promote peace and preserve freedom?" Freedom is

more important, even in the atomic age, than the mere preservation of peace.

Mr. Streit and Justice Roberts stress freedom, and, for that reason, I find their views attractive at first glance and on the surface. I do not reject their arguments on principle as I do Mr. Mowrer's arguments for world government.

Nevertheless, I insist that union of the democracies now would not promote either peace or freedom, even temporarily. It would create division among those forces of the world which must be mobilized to resist potential or actual aggression.

But, that's not even half the story. A strenuous campaign by governments to achieve federal union today would wreck the United Nations. It would also, at least for some years, weaken the democracies themselves and probably destroy the community among them that has been growing apace in recent months.

I take my stand upon the United Nations, not defensively, as Mr. Streit seems to suggest, but positively. I want to preserve and strengthen this one organization that we actually possess—this instrument that its Secretary-General, Trygve Lie, has rightly called “the chief force that holds the world together against all the conflicting strains and stresses that are pulling it apart.”

I know the U. N. is weak. I know and have repeatedly said that it cannot by itself prevent a major

war, but it is emphatically *not* failure. It has prevented wars and made some of them less violent than they might have been. Even if it were otherwise of little value which is not the case, I'd want to keep it solely because the United States and the Soviet Union both belong to it.

Now, Mr. Streit and Mr. Robert both want to keep U. N., but it won't be kept, much less strengthened, if we create a union of the democracies now. Such a union would destroy this one remaining bridge between East and West. The Soviet Union, whether rightly or wrongly, would consider the establishment of such a union a threat to it and would quit the United Nations. The present split would thus be made irrevocable and the world would be divided into at least two, and possibly into more, hostile camps.

Federal Union would also undermine for some time to come the present strength of the democracies themselves. If it could be achieved overnight, that would not be so, but the difficulties are staggering to contemplate and would take years to overcome.

Mr. Streit, Mr. Roberts, and Mr. Mowrer, as well, are fond of citing our American experience in federalism. Well, I can talk that language, too. It took eight years—and some would say even more—to establish our union firmly from the first call, in 1786, for a Constitutional Convention until

the collapse of the Whisky Rebellion in 1794.

Would it not take longer still to form a federal union of the civil liberties democracies? Certainly.

The union and its component parts would have to endure a long time of tension and troubles while adjusting its political, legal, economic, and military machinery to the new regime.

Mr. Streit says the Kremlin would not dare attack the union, but that is *after* its establishment. The attempt to establish a federal union now would be like trying to reorganize an army and train it to use new weapons, all in the face of a dangerous enemy.

Union of the democracies now would not promote peace. It is not desirable. It is not even necessary. The best way to promote freedom and security, while holding some hope of avoiding war, is to carry out the policy the United States is now following—the United Nations, Marshall Plan, and North Atlantic Pact. There is nothing negative about that. I hope you will all throw your strength and your voices behind it. (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Johnson. For a gentleman who has retired after a distinguished career climaxed by holding one of the highest offices any man may seek to attain in this country, our next speaker has embraced his period of leisure with the vigor of a man of 28. His Alma

Mater has called him back to the deanship of the law school from which he graduated with highest honors in 1898—the University of Pennsylvania. His church, the Protestant Episcopal, has made him president of the House of Deputies, and his Government has called upon him to act as chairman of various boards and commissions ever since his retirement.

Nevertheless, Justice Roberts has found time to interest himself actively in the cause of a union of the democracies for which he speaks here tonight. We are happy to welcome to Town Meeting the Honorable Owen J. Roberts, former Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Justice Roberts. (Applause.)

Justice Roberts:

Mr. Johnson and Mr. Mowrer, like all those who have thought about the matter of world order and world peace, think that there is no difference as to the ultimate objective. Peace amongst peoples of the world can come only as the result of justice, and justice can be promoted only by law.

The goal is, therefore, a world federation of all nations. But that goal is obviously impracticable at this day.

What is the first step towards that goal? The only practical beginning is to federate those nations that practice representative government and recognize individual liberty under law—those nations in which the state is the agent

of the people, and not the people the mere pawns of the state.

The practical way to demonstrate that nations can federate is to deal with those nations whose people would understand such a federation, would be loyal to it, and could coöperate in its activities.

These are the very nations with whom we are now negotiating the North Atlantic Alliance. This fact would make it the more practical to go from an alliance to a discussion of a closer—that is, a federal—union with our allies. The fact that they are proposing an alliance indicates clearly that they see the need of closer coöperation amongst them. From this level of an alliance, it ought to be easier to go on to the higher level of international union.

Mr. Streit and I think that Congress should, by resolution, call for the convening of a convention of delegates from the nations concerned to meet and explore the possibility of an international federation.

If our Government were to take the initiative in calling such a convention, the Atlantic democracies would respond by appointing delegates. The work of the convention would be reported to the people of all the nations concerned.

Our own people would have the opportunity to examine and discuss the recommendations of the convention, and, if they approved the plans submitted, to adopt it by amending our own Constitution

so as to make the plan a part of our federal law.

The proposal does not interfere with, nor is it forbidden by, the charter of the United Nations. Nothing in that charter essays to prohibit the nation members from federating or consolidating.

The federation, or the nations composing it, would still retain membership in United Nations for discussion of world problems with nations not members of the union.

An Atlantic alliance would serve as an emergency measure to hold the member nations together during the period of discussion of a closer union.

Meantime, I believe the delegates would soon arrive at the conclusion that an alliance is not enough in the long run, or over a long term, to give the free people of the world the security and the prosperity which must be theirs if peace is to be maintained.

It is not possible, in a brief speech like this, to discuss features of the plan or to answer alleged objections to federation. Let me say this: Nothing can be lost and much may be gained by an exploration of the political and economic advantages of federal union with the Atlantic democracies.

The proposed convention would face difficulties as did our own convention in 1787. I have faith that any difficulties encountered can be surmounted. But if the opponents of such an Atlantic federal union are right in their view that the difficulties are insur-

mountable, only the effort in a free convention to explore the matter can prove that they are right and I'm wrong.

The American people ought to be bold enough to desire an exploration of the whole subject and an authoritative report on the results of that exploration. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Justice Roberts. Our next speaker was for a long time a colleague of Clarence Streit as a foreign correspondent serving in Europe. He was war correspondent for the *Chicago Daily News* in France and Belgium during the first World War, and was later head of the same paper's news bureau in Berlin and in Paris. He was a Pulitzer Prize winner in 1932. During the second World War he was connected with the Office of War Information, and his latest book, *The Nightmare of American Foreign Policy*, as the title indicates, is very controversial indeed. We are happy to have him on tonight's program to discuss the subject in which he finds himself in complete disagreement with Justice Roberts and Mr. Streit. Welcome back to Town Hall, Edgar Ansel Mowrer. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Mowrer:

Thank you, Mr. Denny. The union of democracies now, so eloquently advocated by Mr. Streit and Mr. Justice Roberts, might conceivably prolong the present armed truce, but only at the risk

of making permanent peace impossible, or risky. Therefore, though for quite other reasons, I agree with Mr. Johnson that it is too costly to be undertaken.

First, it would disrupt the Pan-American system by the exclusion of Latin America. Both Mr. Streit and Mr. Roberts testified last year before the House Foreign Affairs Committee that most Latin American governments would not be admissible to the union. Excluding these countries would mean the ruin of the American front. It would promote lasting bitterness in the excluded republics.

Second, it would smash the British Commonwealth. Some of the Commonwealth members might be permitted to enter the union. Others like India, Ceylon, and South Africa probably could not meet a rigorous democratic test.

Third, it would burst the French union which links France with North Africa, Madagascar, and Indo-China, and destroy the projected Netherlands-Indonesian Union. The demands of backward excluded areas for complete independence would then either have to be accepted or be suppressed in blood. Obviously, a union of democracies that comprised only white people would intensify the already dangerous color rivalry.

Next we should see the excluded non-democratic countries of Asia, Africa, and perhaps of Latin America drifting into the Soviet camp,

for, between the schoolmasterly advice from the democratic union and a warm welcoming embrace by Mother Russia, which would be the more attractive?

At the same time, the problem of still imperfectly democratic Germany would become insoluble, for both sides in the present conflict would struggle fiercely to hang onto their part of Germany, while the Germans struggled fiercely for their unity. Hence, another constant element of disorder.

Then finally, almost surely, the Soviet Union would counter a union of democracies by absorbing into itself the present satellite states. These poor peoples could never become free and independent again except by a world war, by a complete Soviet breakdown, or by the establishment of freedom and democracy within Russia. The first would be catastrophic, the second is most unlikely, and the third is a long time process.

The present tragic world split would be perpetuated, as Mr. Johnson says. Making a union of democracies would serve notice on the Soviets that until they accepted Western freedom and democracy, they could never be part of a united world. This means there could never be real peace until Russia became democratic or the democracies went communist.

Yet only a world union can end the air and atom armament race that is now well under way. It is

clear that the union of democracies, as it consolidated itself and as the Soviet bloc tightened its strings, would intensify the present arms race.

For the three quarters of the human race left outside the union of democracies would surely try to catch up and surpass the one quarter taken into the union. As the consequence, in a process of arming to defend itself, the union would progressively lose those human freedoms which make it most worth while defending, and at the end, the war of the elect against the outcasts.

This is what Mr. Streit and Mr. Roberts would get—the very opposite of what they want.

Permanent peace needs more than a union of a few countries. It needs a lot more than the present impotent U. N. so dear to Mr. Johnson.

It needs a world-wide organization developed out of the present United Nations which would permit the free to remain free, and the unfree to develop toward freedom, not by atomic rivalry, but in unshakable security—the security which only world government can give. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Mowrer. How much easier it would be if we didn't all have to think about this question. Well, Mr. Streit, a good many darts have been hurled in the direction of your plan now, so I think we'd better have a little

huddle around the microphone, and we'll hear from you first. Mr. Streit?

Mr. Streit: Mr. Mowrer was saying that union would disrupt about everything—the British Commonwealth, the French Union, Pan-America, and everything else. When I spoke about this ten years ago, one of my opponents conjured up another danger. He said it would bring together, quite possibly, the Soviets and the Nazis and Fascists. He foresaw that.

I would like to point out that that happened but not through any union being made. A great many of these dangers that are conjured up have been coming down on us, but not through any union being made. I would like to ask Mr. Mowrer if the Atlantic Alliance that we are making now is not disrupting Pan-America, and if it is not disrupting the British Commonwealth, and if it's not disrupting the French Union, and all that? Why on earth should a convention called to change that alliance into a union cause all these calamities?

Mr. Mowrer: The reason is, Mr. Streit, that the present North Atlantic security pact is a temporary alliance meant to deal with a specific situation. It does not tell the peoples of Latin America that, until they rise to our level, they are going to be excluded, nor the peoples of Asia and Africa that, until they arise to our level, they are going to be excluded. It simply says that in a certain area the peoples of that area will band together

to oppose another bloc which has already been formed by our Soviet friends.

If it were to become permanent, as you want, it would have exactly the same result, in fact it would be the "union of democracies now." Far better, therefore, let us have an open alliance leading to an open federation into which all peoples of good will, regardless of their form of government, can join. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Johnson?

Mr. Johnson: From this point, I cannot see that an open world government is achievable in our time or for a long time to come. As Mr. Roberts has said, "A federal union must be based upon democracy." I frankly do not see how one can have a world government which is not based upon democracy.

Mr. Denny: All right. Mr. Johnson?

Mr. Johnson: I should like to ask Mr. Mowrer how he would have the Russian representatives to the Parliament named in his federation?

Mr. Denny: Well, we were about to discuss the Federalist plan now, but—

Mr. Mowrer: It is kind of you to discuss my plan now rather than that of Mr. Streit. I would like to say that I think that the Russian representatives would be named in much the same way as the representatives of some of our southern states have been named to the

Congress of the United States (*laughter and applause*), and yet I did not feel that that necessarily disrupted our Federal Union.

Mr. Denny: All right, Mr. Streit?

Mr. Streit: Well, Mr. Mowrer, you were saying that we are going

to lose our freedom by this atomic or this arms race if we make a union. But it seems to me that by system of alliance, by getting our strength by this flimsy alliance system, we are not only doing it in the weakest way, but we are

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

OWEN J. ROBERTS — The Honorable

Owen J. Roberts, now Dean of the Law School at the University of Pennsylvania, was formerly a Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Born in Philadelphia in 1875, he received his A.B. degree from the University of Pennsylvania and his LL.B. from Beaver College. He has been granted LL.D. degrees by Beaver College, Ursinus College, University of Pennsylvania, Lafayette College, Pennsylvania Military College, Dickinson College, Trinity College, Williams College, Princeton University, and Temple University.

Justice Roberts began his practice of law in Philadelphia in 1898. From 1901 to 1904, he was first assistant district attorney of Philadelphia County. From 1898 to 1918, he was a member of the law faculty at the University of Pennsylvania, advancing from instructor to professor. He was appointed special deputy attorney general to represent the United States Government in the prosecution of cases arising under the Espionage Act in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania during World War I.

In 1924, Justice Roberts was appointed by President Coolidge to prosecute the famous "oil cases." He was made an associate justice of the Supreme Court in 1930 and served until July, 1945. In September, 1948, he took up his present position at the University of Pennsylvania.

CLARENCE K. STREIT — Mr. Streit is president of Federal Union, Inc., and the author of *Union Now* (1939) and *Union Now With Britain* (1941).

Born in California, Missouri, he moved to Western Montana while he was still a youth and graduated from Montana State University. He also studied at the Sorbonne and was a Rhodes scholar. He has received several honorary degrees, in addition to an LL.D. from Colby, 1941, and D.Litt. from Oberlin, in 1940.

During World War I, Mr. Streit served as a sergeant in the Intelligence

Service attached to the American Delegation to the Peace Conference. From 1920-24, he was foreign correspondent for the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* in Paris, the Near East, and Italy. From 1925-39, he reported for the *New York Times* on the Carthage excavations, the Riff War, and other European news. He was Vienna correspondent from 1925-27 and from 1929-39 was League of Nations correspondent.

He is the editor of *Freedom and Union*, a monthly magazine, begun in October, 1946.

EDGAR ANSEL MOWRER — Mr. Mowrer, author, foreign correspondent, and columnist, was formerly deputy director of the Office of War Information. He is national director of the Nonpartisan Council To Win the Peace. He has been a contributor to American and English magazines since 1913, and he was war correspondent for the *Chicago Daily News* for over 25 years. Mr. Mowrer was graduated from the University of Michigan, and he also attended the University of Chicago and the Sorbonne, Paris. In 1932, he received the Pulitzer prize in Journalism for his book, *Germany Puts the Clock Back*.

JOSEPH ESREY JOHNSON — Born in Longdale, Virginia, in 1906, Dr. Johnson has his Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctor's degrees from Harvard. After a short while as instructor in history at Bowdoin College, he became an instructor at Williams College. He has been an assistant professor since 1938. On leave of absence from Williams since 1942, he has been engaged in government affairs as an officer in the Department of State. In 1944, he became acting chief of the division of International Security Affairs, and has been chief since 1945. He has acted in the capacity of official adviser to the United States delegations at most of the recent international conferences.

doing it in the most expensive way, both for liberty and for our pocketbooks.

How do you mean that we can get more arms by an alliance or by waiting—I don't know what we're going to do in the meantime—than by federating our power? If we are losing freedom by union, well, aren't we going to lose more freedom by an alliance?

Mr. Mowrer: No, the amount of freedom that we might lose by an alliance and/or by union today would be identically the same, since neither one would suppress the air and atom armament race which threatens our civil liberties. If I have to travel from here to Washington, where I live, and I have to start out in a horse and buggy, I would rather know that the horse and buggy is a temporary device which is supposed to get me to Newark where I can change into the Pennsylvania train, rather than going all the way to Washington in it.

Mr. Streit: I'm for stopping an arms race, too, but the way I would stop it is by getting so much strength by this union that we would not be in danger from that score. We're not worried about Franco, we're not worried about Argentina because we have so much strength behind our free principles here that we know they won't attack, and they know we're not going to attack them.

I think, Mr. Mowrer, that you underestimate tremendously the power behind this union—not only

the armed power, not only the productive power, not only the raw material power, but the moral power of people sacrificing that much sovereignty for freedom. Also, the joker, the last power, the big fact is that this union, once it started, would be bringing other countries into it, and thus putting a premium on democracy to the world. This is no exclusive set. It is the common-sense way to get started.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Did you have something to say, Mr. Streit?

Mr. Streit: I wanted to ask Mr. Mowrer why he thought such a union would disrupt the British Commonwealth when every responsible statesman in Britain has said they'd like to discuss it with other democracies; why he thinks it would disrupt the French Commonwealth, because the French have in their Constitution an invitation to other nations to sit down and discuss it with them.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Mowrer?

Mr. Mowrer: My answer is because I presumed Mr. Streit and Mr. Justice Roberts were men who meant exactly what they said and when they said they would admit into union now only democratic states—and I mean democratic democratic, and not Russian forms of phony democracy—I, therefore, assumed that they would naturally have to exclude those semi-autonomous parts of otherwise independent states which are manifestly not able to govern themselves on a democratic basis.

There are certain of the British dominions—commonwealths as they are now called—which certainly do not fulfill our ideas of democracy, and I speak specifically of South Africa where you have two million whites refusing the vote to eight million blacks.

I speak specifically of India where so far the franchise out of four hundred million people amounts to not more than ten million citizens.

And I speak somewhat more guardedly of Ceylon, where there has been a closer approximation to what we would call democracy, but nothing like a free vote at the present time.

As for the French Union, the French plan a union in which their colonies will become integral parts of the French Union, but obviously these colonies, for a long time to come, will not be able to carry out democratic processes as they are carried out in France and in the United States. Therefore, it seemed to me logical to conclude that they would be excluded.

If I am wrong, I would love to be corrected and see that my friends and adversaries tonight were taking a more liberal view.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Johnson, you've been rather quiet there.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Denny, I'd like to ask Mr. Streit a question. I referred to the Whisky Rebellion. I'd like to ask him how long he thinks it would be before the Cognac Rebellion broke out and how he

would deal with it? (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Streit: I don't know where that rebellion would be—over here or over there? But I would like to ask you a question, Mr. Johnson. You said that the formation of this union would wreck the United Nations. Well, about one month ago, in fact on February 10, Mr. John Foster Dulles, who was one of our delegates to the United Nations—is still, I believe—issued a public statement in which he said he agreed with the sentiment you uttered, Mr. Johnson, on the world government idea at this time. But, he said, that the attempt to establish a government on a regional basis; or where like-minded nations could come together—and he mentioned in that group the Atlantic group—was not open to these objections and had many advantages. He saw no danger to the United Nations in the program that we are advocating. Well, then, why should you?

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Dulles and I don't always think alike. I do see very definitely a danger. I think that there is a possibility, I don't think it's a reality, but I think there is a possibility that the North Atlantic Alliance may lead the Soviet Union to reconsider seriously its position in the United Nations. I don't think it will go out, but I am convinced that anything so strong, so complete as a federal union of the democracies which would appear to the Soviet Union as potentially a menace to it, would very definitely lead the

Soviet Union to strike while we were at our weakest. I still would like to know how long it's going to take to form this federal union. It doesn't have to be a Whisky Rebellion or a Cognac Rebellion, it could be a Beer Rebellion.

Mr. Streit: May I answer that question? Suppose, between 1787 and 1794, our infant Nation had been attacked. Could anything have consolidated our Government more absolutely than such an attack and any threatened attack will only accelerate the working of such a union.

Second, you say that you think that the Soviets would not go out if we formed the Atlantic Pact. The Soviet itself claims to be a federation of independent states—Byelorussia, Georgia, and what have you. Would you give Russia more excuse to go out if we formed a federation of independent states like our own, or if we formed a military alliance which is shaking the sword? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right. Mr. Johnson, very quickly.

Mr. Johnson: I would like to say this, that as far as the organization of the United States was concerned, it was 3,000 miles from any great power—not next door as Norway and some other countries are—and none of those powers regarded it as a menace at that time.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now while we get ready for our questions, the announcer has a message for our listeners.

Announcer: From historic Town

Hall, just off Times Square in New York City, we are presenting the 550th broadcast of America's Town Meeting, the Nation's most popular radio and television forum.

Our question is "Will a Union of the Democracies Now Promote Peace?" On our panel are the Honorable Owen J. Roberts, dean of the University of Pennsylvania law school; Clarence Streit, author of *Union Now*; foreign correspondent Edgar Ansel Mowrer; and Joseph E. Johnson, professor of history at Williams College.

You may obtain a copy of the Town Meeting Bulletin, containing a complete transcript of this program, by writing to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, enclosing ten cents. Please do not send stamps, and allow at least two weeks for delivery.

On a subscription basis, the Town Meeting Bulletin is \$4.50 per year; \$2.35 for six months—or you may subscribe for eleven issues for one dollar. Many previous programs are still in print and you may write for copies of those you have missed.

When you order your copy of tonight's discussion, why not send along a suggestion for the 14th anniversary broadcast of America's Town Meeting on May 31? On that occasion we want to discuss the one question which is uppermost in the minds of our listeners. We've already received many suggestions—some on topics dealing with international issues, others on national affairs and social prob-

lems. We'll appreciate *your* counsel, and the one subject which you, our listeners, mention more than any other will be discussed on

May 31, Town Meeting's 14th anniversary program.

Now for our questions from the audience, here again is Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: We're going to start with the gentleman right here in the fourth row.

Man: My question is for Mr. Streit. What is the principle, not the territorial, difference between the North Atlantic Defense Pact and the federal union of democracies?

Mr. Streit: That's an excellent question. The difference in principle is this. The alliance is an association of governments. A federal union is a government itself. It is a government of, by, and for the people. I should like to talk longer on that but—

Mr. Denny: Yes, sir, that's long enough. Thank you. (*Laughter.*) Let's take the next question over on the other side of the house.

Man: Mr. Mowrer, isn't peace an immediate issue? If so, wouldn't the erection of a world government, especially getting Russia into it, take too long to be an effective road to peace?

Mr. Denny: Over here, Mr. Mowrer. You're walking in the wrong direction.

Mr. Mowrer: I do not think that it would take too long to get us on the road to peace. I think that if we started tomorrow morning to get an effective world government, we could have it going within the

next ten years. But, of course, it's ten years from the moment when we start.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. The gentleman back there in the center.

Man: My question is directed to Justice Roberts. I would like to know just by what standards do we judge whether a country is democratic or not, and thereby entitled to membership in the proposed Atlantic Alliance.

Justice Roberts: I have a very clear standard in my mind. I do not want to be federated with any people that doesn't observe representative government—government by freely elected representatives. And I don't want to be federated with any people that doesn't recognize the individual liberties under law that are embodied in our own Bill of Rights—freedom of the press, religion, and so on.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady under the balcony.

Lady: My question is directed to Mr. Johnson. I'd like to know, if we leave Russia out of a world union, do you think peace could ever be in sight?

Mr. Johnson: If we leave Russia out of a world union, do we think peace would ever be in sight? I am

not sure that peace is ever going to be in sight. That may be a very discouraging answer to give you, but I see no reason, as a historian, to believe that we can ever be sure that there will be peace—permanent peace. I am not at all convinced that peace is the best thing. Freedom, to my mind, is much more important. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The man on the aisle.

Man: This is for Justice Roberts. What, exactly, is your yardstick as a measure of which countries are democracies and which are not? As I gather it, you said you would take the outward appearances of whether the people would have a say.

Justice Roberts: Not the outward appearances—the substance of it.

Mr. Denny: All right. We've dealt with that question. Now we'll take a question from the gentleman right down the aisle.

Man: To Mr. Johnson. Are you not merely appeasing the Kremlin by arguing that the union of free peoples would destroy the United Nations by alienating Russia?

Mr. Johnson: I certainly do not think that anything I have proposed or stand for is appeasing the Kremlin. I do not think the Marshall Plan is appeasing the Kremlin. I do not think the North Atlantic Pact is appeasing the Kremlin. I do think there are advantages in having the Soviet Union there in meetings where we can talk to them and listen to them

and get things back at them and discuss with them rather than have the Iron Curtain closed down completely. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentlemen over on the other side.

Man: Mr. Mowrer. What force, if any, would be employed in the world government to make it effective?

Mr. Mowrer: An international police force superior to the force of any member nation. As usual, it would rely, like all other governments, upon the concensus of the majority of mankind interested in peace and decency, rather than in disorder. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: The lady in green, please.

Lady: Mr. Streit. How much sovereignty would you have each nation yield to your proposed union?

Mr. Denny: How much authority would you have each nation yield?

Audience: Sovereignty!

Mr. Denny: Sovereignty. I beg your pardon.

Mr. Streit: Personally, I would have the democratic nations transfer to this federal union the same powers, roughly speaking, that the thirteen states transferred to our United States. But I do not consider that any sacrifice of sovereignty on their part because in a democratic government the citizens are sovereign. They are losing no sovereignty when they make that transfer. They have the same power over policy they had

before. The powers that I think ought to be transferred would be that the union would have control over foreign policy and the armed forces; that you would have a common currency; that you would have a common free trade customs union within the union; you would have a common postal and communications system; and a common citizenship.

But it is not for me to answer that question alone; that's just my idea. What Mr. Justice Roberts and I are trying to get is to have a convention called of the peoples who have developed the most free representative government and let them answer that problem. We will then find out just how far they think they can go in forming a common democratic government.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman on this aisle over here.

Man: Mr. Justice Roberts. Could a United States Senator vote for union of the democracies without violating his oath of office as a Senator?

Justice Roberts: We cannot establish a union of the democracies in which the people of the United States are a part without an amendment of our Constitution. Of course not! The legislators are delegates of us, and they have no power to give away any of our sovereignty; that's in us. We can do it by amending our Constitution, which I think we should do.

Man: Wouldn't they have to initiate it?

Justice Roberts: Oh, they could

call a convention. The Convention of 1787 was called because the convention binds nobody.

Man: Could they legally call the convention without violating their oath?

Justice Roberts: Certainly, they could appoint delegates to a convention to talk with the representatives of other nations. Certainly they could do that.

Man: For a purpose of changing our form of government?

Justice Roberts: For a purpose of submitting something to the people to change their form of government by an amendment of the Constitution. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady in the red sweater.

Lady: This question is addressed to Mr. Johnson. Mr. Johnson, how could we stop Russia from vetoing any peace measure we might try to adopt in the U. N. at present.

Mr. Denny: Just a minute. We didn't get that. How can we prevent Russia from vetoing any proposal that comes through the United Nations now?

Mr. Johnson: The veto operates only in the Security Council. The veto does not operate in the General Assembly. There have been peace proposals put forward in the General Assembly. There was proposed a Little Assembly a year and a half ago, and it met last summer and did a good deal in the way of laying the groundwork for more permanent and better system for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Mr. Streit: Won't you tell the

young lady that the Assembly has no power to pass any resolution binding anybody?

Mr. Johnson: The Assembly does have power to pass resolutions, and they bind you and me morally if our country votes for them.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Justice Roberts, do you want to speak on that?

Justice Roberts: Of course. It's perfectly evident that Russia can veto any action in the Security Council. It's perfectly evident that the Assembly can resolute and resolute and resolute and the Security Council can ignore what it resolutes. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Yes?

Man: Mr. Streit, would the proposed union admit democracies only as new members?

Mr. Streit: I would expect it to admit democracies only. That would be left, I should think, in the federal constitution to the congress of that union to decide. Our present Constitution says that Congress may admit new states to the Union, period. And it leaves, very wisely, I think, the decision in each specific case to be drawn, to be made by the Congress representing the people at that time. I think that would be the wisest solution of the question that you put.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady here.

Lady: For Mr. Mowrer. Instead of arbitrarily dividing our world into democratic sheep versus undemocratic goats, why not world

federalism to welcome all nations so long as they send delegates chosen by popular vote?

Mr. Mowrer: Why not, indeed!

Mr. Johnson: I would like to know how you choose them by popular vote in certain countries of this world. I still do not see the answer to that question which Mr. Mowrer has never answered, nor have any of his colleagues to my knowledge.

Mr. Mowrer: Wait just a minute.

Mr. Denny: We're about to discuss the World Federalist Plan now, but go ahead. Go ahead..

Mr. Mowrer: World Federalists believe that we should certainly advocate the selection of delegates to any international body by popular vote. But, just as in this country we have put up with appointed delegates, not only from the Southern States, but from certain cities, congressional districts, and so on, in which the democratic process has been flouted, for the sake of peace and gradual evolution, we believe that we should accept delegates, if necessary, appointed by governments, for the purpose of keeping the peace of the world.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Justice Roberts.

Justice Roberts: Does he see any difference between the Soviet Union and the State of Mississippi?

Mr. Mowrer: I do, indeed. I see the difference between a state in which tyranny is total and a state in which democracy is flouted only a little bit, but still too much.

Mr. Streit: I would like to com-

ment on the implication in the lady's question that we're dividing the world into sheep and into goats. This isn't a question on any moral basis of that type at all. It is a very common sense question. There are certain peoples that have developed this Town Meeting system, this free system, and very few peoples in the world have succeeded in operating any length of time on this free system of ours. In fact, I find only about one-seventh of the human race has been able to operate on that basis.

The question is, are we going to lose that, are we going to defend that by alliance, by ourselves alone, or by alliance, or by the federal system? And once having put this strength behind democracy and saved peace, then we go on from there as the thirteen states did. It isn't a question of any exclusion there, it's a common sense question of getting started on the way to maintain our freedom.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Mowrer has a comment on that.

Mr. Mowrer: It seems to me that I agree with Mr. Streit that there are only one-seventh or one-sixth of the human race that rules itself democratically. I believe that ruling oneself democratically is better than any other form of government. But if the communion of saints are going to keep remote from the sinners, I see little chance that the sinners are going to be speedily converted. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young lady in that beautiful orange

blouse or is that orange? Yes, it's orange. All right, go ahead.

Lady: Justice Roberts. Before we can federate the world, we are making Russia our enemy and making war inevitable. Why not work wholeheartedly through the U. N. and make the U. N. the world government?

Justice Roberts: How do you do that? We have said that we'd like to discuss a parliamentary system, but Mr. Vishinsky and Mr. Molotov have said, "No!" period. Now how do you do it? We know perfectly well that the Russian Government can't join a federation in which there's representative government, and they won't join a federation in which people are protected from concentration camps and from the gallows. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young lady on the aisle. Yes?

Lady: Mr. Streit. Is the American economy more important than peace so we cannot join governments, or are our unfounded biases too strong?

Mr. Denny: Is the American economy more important than our biases against other forms of economy? Is that what you're driving at?

Lady: No. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: Well, make it a little clearer so that simple people like Mr. Streit and I can understand. (*Laughter.*)

Lady: Are the American economy and biases too strong that we cannot join governments for a world government?

Mr. Denny: Oh, do you get it now, Mr. Streit? She thinks that our bias against other forms of government is so strong that we can't bring other governments into a world government. In other words, she's accusing you of being biased, and prejudiced in favor of our economy.

That certainly is the implication of the question, isn't it? (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Streit: I am biased in favor of our economy. Where on earth would the world be now if it weren't for that free enterprise economy? What has the world been eating for the last two or three years? What but the products of the democratic system? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now while our speakers prepare their summaries of tonight's discussion, here's a message of interest to you.

Announcer: As you listen to these discussions every Tuesday night, how many times have you asked yourself, "What can I do?" What can I do to bring these problems to the attention of more people, and what else can I do right here in my city, in my small town, my neighbor?"

First, of course, you can be a modern town crier and tell your friends about America's Town Meeting.

Then you can follow the simple 12-point program suggested by our moderator, Mr. Denny, in his little booklet titled *What Can You Do?* In his introduction, Mr. Denny

says: "Our way of life is based upon a deep religious conviction of the supreme worth of the individual, and that no state, organization or institution of any kind shall be allowed to interfere with our freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of worship, freedom of assembly. To preserve this way of life in the world today, we, as individuals, can and must do certain things to meet our responsibilities."

And so for your copy of *What Can You Do?* just write to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, enclosing ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing.

Now for the summaries we return you to Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: We're ready for Mr. Edgar Ansel Mowrer.

Mr. Mowrer: In my judgment, freedom and peace for democrats and ultimately for everybody on earth are both possible. They cannot be had by putting our hopes into an unchanged U. N. which, except to Americans like Mr. Johnson, has already demonstrated its inadequacy. They cannot be had by any exclusive union of a few nations advocated by Mr. Streit and Mr. Roberts.

They can be had if the American leaders begin today planning that transformation of the present U. N. into a world-wide federation able to enact, interpret, and enforce world law. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Mowrer. And now, Mr. Justice Roberts.

Justice Roberts: The debate tonight hinges not on principle, but on procedure. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Mowrer would like to see international federation, but they are fearful of trying to get it. They are like the men who in 1787 said of our own Federal Union, "You can't do it." If Washington, Madison, Hamilton, and Franklin had heeded that sort of talk, we'd have had no Union. Thank God, they were not, like Mr. Johnson and Mr. Mowrer, practical men. They were dreamers and idealists.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson: Let's not abandon something good, something tangible, and something positive that we have. "Let's," as Hamilton said in 1788, "make it work even if it is not perfect!" instead of going in pursuit of a will-of-the-wisp.

Let's stick to the present policy: Vigorous support of a stronger United Nations, encouragement of democracy and economic recovery in Europe through the Marshall Plan, adoption of a North Atlantic Pact to prove to the menaced lands of Western Europe that the American people today intend to act by Franklin's words, "We must all hang together, or we shall assuredly all hang separate." (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Johnson. And your final word, Mr. Streit.

Mr. Streit: We are already uniting with the Atlantic democracies by alliance. If we can do that with-

out all the dangers that you have been warned about here tonight, we can even more safely unite with them by federal union.

It all boils down to this: Shall we put our trust in the alliance system? Or shall we call a federal convention of the same Atlantic democracies and try to change the alliance into a union of the free? If you believe the latter is the wiser, then let us hear from you. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Streit, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Justice Roberts, and Mr. Joseph E. Johnson, for your contribution to our understanding on this subject. Once again, listeners, we invite you to send your opinions which we will gladly forward to all four speakers.

Important as is the question of world peace, we have before us the question that has been occupying a great deal of attention in both houses of Congress ever since the 81st Congress convened this January. Next Tuesday our program will originate in Boston where we will be the guest of our Boston sponsors. We will discuss the question, "Should the Taft-Hartley Law Be Repealed and the Administration Labor Bill Adopted?" The speakers will be Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin and Mr. Gerhard P. Van Arkel, attorney and former General Counsel of the NLRB, who will lock horns with Senator Forrest C. Donnell, Republican of Missouri and former Congressman Fred A. Hartley, Jr.,

o-author of the Taft-Hartley Act. The meeting will be held in the Boston Opera House and our Boston listeners may obtain tickets by writing to station WCOP in Boston.

Two weeks from tonight, March 2, in Washington, D. C., we will be the guests of the U. S. Conference of Mayors on the subject, "How Can We Legislate for General Welfare Without Curbing Personal Liberty?" Our speakers will be Senator Robert A. Taft, Republican of Ohio; Congressman John W. McCormack, Democrat of

Massachusetts; Henry Hazlitt, business columnist for *Newsweek* magazine and author of *Economics in One Lesson*, and another speaker to be announced.

Now, if you'd like a copy of tonight's discussion, just write to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, enclosing ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. Do not send stamps, and allow at least two weeks for delivery. We invite you to be with us next Tuesday and every Tuesday at the sound of the crier's bell. (*Applause.*)



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 14

7. Whom Should the Republicans Nominate for President?
8. Whom Should the Democrats Nominate for President?
9. Are You Preparing To Grow Old Successfully?
10. What Are the Major Issues in the Coming Election?
11. What Is Americanism?
12. Should We Teach Sex Education in Our Schools?
13. Does Military Preparedness Mean Security?
14. How Should the United Nations Progressively Establish International Law?
15. Should Congress Pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Bill Now?
16. What Should We Do in the Berlin Situation?
17. Should College Football Be Subsidized?
18. Is Our Present Foreign Policy Leading to Peace or War?
19. Is the Church Failing Our Youth?
20. Are the Congressional Spy Investigations Serving the National Interest?
21. What Hope for Man?
22. How Can Schools and Colleges Teach Controversial Issues?
24. How Is Peace With Russia Possible?
25. How Will Television Affect Motion Pictures?

26. What Should the United Nations Do About Palestine?
27. What Hope for Europe Now?
28. What Should We Do About Race Segregation?
29. What Should the Administration Do About the High Cost of Living?
30. Should There Be Stricter Government Control of Lobbies?
31. Are Our Ideals Being Destroyed by the Machine Age?
32. Is a United Protestant Church Possible Now?
33. What Does the Crisis in China Mean to Us?
35. Is Labor Entitled to Another Wage Increase?
36. Are Corporate Profits Too High?
37. What's Behind the Crisis in Indonesia?
38. Can Modern Capitalism Meet the Needs of Modern Man?
39. Are We Educating for the Needs of Modern Man?
40. How Can We Make a Defense Pact With Western Europe?
41. Do We Need a New Approach to Peace?
42. Is There Any Defense Against Atomic Warfare?
43. Should We Adopt a Compulsory National Health Insurance Program?
44. Should Communists Be Allowed To Teach in Our Colleges?

123 West 43d St., New York 18, N. Y.

Order single copies at 10c each from TOWN HALL, Inc.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate:

26 Weeks for Only
\$2.35
Single Copies 10c

